



In order to “overcome the First Amendment right of access,” the proponent of sealing judicial documents bears the burden of showing that “closure is essential to preserve higher values and is narrowly tailored to serve that interest.” *Bernstein v. Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossman LLP*, 814 F.3d 132, 144 (2d Cir. 2016) (quoting *In re N.Y. Times Co.*, 828 F.2d 110, 116 (2d Cir. 1987)). In particular, the need to maintain secrecy for sensitive business information and practices can “outweigh the presumption of public access.” *SEC v. Telegram Grp. Inc.*, 2020 WL 3264264, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. June 17, 2020) (citing *United States v. Amodeo*, 71 F.3d 1044, 1051 (2d Cir. 1995)). For example, a proponent can demonstrate it has overcome the presumption of public access by showing the documents in question “contain highly proprietary material concerning . . . marketing strategies, product development, costs and budgeting.” *GoSMiLE, Inc. v. Dr. Jonathan Levine, D.M.D. P.C.*, 769 F. Supp. 2d 630, 649–50 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).

With respect to each motion, I have reviewed the applicable letter request, supporting declarations, and exhibits, and conclude that maintaining the requested documents and redactions under seal is warranted.

Accordingly, the requests to seal are granted. The Clerk shall terminate ECF Nos. 468, 472, 474, 485, 514, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 525, 529, 533, 536, and 542.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 25, 2022  
New York, New York

/s/  
ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN  
United States District Judge